



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,800	01/06/2004	Bryan Severt Hallberg	8371-170	6457

46404 7590 06/15/2007
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204.

EXAMINER

ADEGEYE, OLUWASEUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/15/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/753,800

Applicant(s)

HALLBERG, BRYAN SEVERT

Examiner

Oluwaseun A. Adegeye

Art Unit

2609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/06/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The references listed on the information disclosure statement filed on 08/26/2005 and 01/06/2005 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO – 1449).

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vantalon et al (US 7,216,358 B1).

As to claim 1, Vantalon discloses a television system (see column 3, lines 66 – 67), comprising:

a media encoder (48) having an input for accepting an incoming video media stream (see column 7, lines 10 – 16);

a first storage location (46) coupled to the media encoder and structured to buffer an encoded media stream (see column 7, lines 16 – 17) ;

a processor (42) structured to generate signals to copy portions of the buffered media stream to an interface for removable media (28) (see column 7, lines 33 – 35) ;

a second storage location (36) structured to store encoded data retrieved from the interface (see column 5, lines 19 – 30 and column 7, lines 24 – 27); and

a decoder (33) coupled to the second storage location and structured to deliver an outgoing video stream (see column 5, lines 19 – 23).

As to claim 2, Vantalon discloses the television system of claim 1 wherein the interface comprises a slot structured to hold a PCMCIA card (see column 6, lines 57 – 59 and column 7, lines 35 – 36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2609

7. Claims 3, 4, 5 – 6 and 9 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Hong et al (US 2002/0039245 A1).

As to claim 3, Vantalon discloses the television system of claim 1 but does not disclose wherein the interface is structured to hold more than one removable media simultaneously.

Hong discloses wherein the interface is structured to hold more than one removable media simultaneously (see [36] and [40]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an interface structured to hold more than one removable media simultaneously taught by Hong to the apparatus of Vantalon to expand the storage capacity of the device (see [003]).

As to claim 4, Hong discloses the television system of claim 1 wherein the interface comprises a set of pins structured to connect to a removable media item to the processor (laptop) (see [35] and [36]).

As to claim 5, Hong discloses the television system of claim 3 wherein the interface comprises:

a first set of pins (222a) structured to connect a first piece of removable media to the processor (see [36]); and

a second set of pins (222b) structured to connect a second piece of removable media to the processor (see [36]).

Art Unit: 2609

As to claim 6, Hong discloses the television system of claim 5 wherein at least one of the pins from the first set connects to a same input of the processor as at least one of the pins from the second set (see [36]).

Grounds for rejecting claims 3 - 6 apply for claims 9 - 12 respectively in its entirety.

8. Claims 7 - 8, 13 - 15 and 18 - 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Bezzant et al (US 6,014,717).

As to claim 7, Vantalon discloses an audio/video system (see column 5, lines 35 - 38), comprising:

a media encoder (48) having an input for accepting a media stream (see column 7, lines 10 - 16), and having a control input (17) for accepting a command to encode the media stream (see column 7, lines 17 - 20);

a storage location (46) coupled to the media encoder and structured to buffer an encoded media stream(see column 7, lines 16 - 17);

a controller (17) coupled to the media encoder and to the storage location, the controller structured to accept a command from the media encoder after the encoded media stream is stored in the storage location (see column 5, lines 38 - 51 and column 7, lines 17 - 20);

a processor (42) structured to generate signals to copy portions of the buffered media stream to the interface when removable media (28) is coupled to the interface (see column 7, lines 33 - 35).

Vantalon does not disclose a detector structured to detect presence of removable media coupled to an interface of the controller.

Bezzant discloses a detector (108) structured to detect presence of removable media coupled to an interface of the controller (see column 5, lines 2 – 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added a detector taught by Bezzant to the device of Vantalon to improve the speed and efficiency of the system (see column 1, lines 25 – 30).

As to claim 8, Vantalon discloses the system of claim 7 wherein the interface (70) (see column 6, line 59) comprises a slot structured to hold a PCMCIA card (see column 7, lines 35 – 36).

Regarding claim 13, this is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 7. Therefore claim 13 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 7.

As to claim 14, Bezzant discloses the method of claim 13 wherein detecting the presence of removable media comprises interrogating a PCMCIA slot to determine if a PC card is inserted therein (see column 5, lines 2 – 8).

As to claim 15, Vantalon discloses the method of claim 13, further comprising: generating signals to transmit data from the removable media (see column 7, lines 29 – 33) to a decoder (33) (see column 5, lines 35 – 38).

Grounds for rejecting claims 14 and 15 apply for claims 18 and 19 respectively in its entirety.

9. Claim 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Bezzant as applied to claims 7 and 13 above, and further in view of Chung et al (US 2004/0150637 A1).

As to claim 16, Vantalon in view of Bezzant discloses the method of claim 13 but does not disclose wherein generating signals to transmit data comprises executing a java applet.

Chung discloses wherein generating signals to transmit data comprises executing a java applet (see [41]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added executing a java applet taught by Chung to the apparatus of Vantalon in view of Bezzant so that applets and mark up documents are simultaneously displayed when displaying the markup document linked to the applets (see [007]).

Grounds for rejecting claim 16 apply for claim 20 in its entirety.

10. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Bezzant as applied to claims 7 and 13 above, and further in view of McMillen et al (US 4,630,258).

As to claim 17, this claim is similar to claim 13 only in that the limitation "generating signals to mark as unoccupied portions of the buffer from which data has been transmitted to the removable media" is additionally cited.

McMillen clearly discloses status signals indicative of full/empty status of each of the memory locations in memory (see column 2, lines 49 – 53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the status signals indicative of full/empty status of each of the memory locations in memory taught by McMillen to the apparatus of Vantalon in view of Bezzant to reduce the output port contention among data packets arriving at the same input port (see column 1, lines 7 – 15).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,016,402 discloses removable disk drives.

Priority

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oluwaseun A. Adegeye whose telephone number is 571-270-1711. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2609

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

06/07/2007

O.A


THANH Q. TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER 2600